

In the Office Action of **October 22, 2002**, Claims 11 and 21 were allowed. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for this determination.

Claims 1-10, 12-16, 19 and 22-29 Stand Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-10, 12-16, 19 and 22-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,655,148 (hereinafter Richman et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,003,100 (hereinafter Lee). It is respectfully submitted that Richman et al. and Lee individually or combined fail to describe or suggest the present invention as claimed. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 7 of the present application are independent claims drawn to a wireless provisioning device. Both claims feature a wireless provisioning device with an authenticator in operative communication with the operating system to allow authentication at the wireless provisioning device, such that a user of a mobile computing device can connect to the wireless provisioning device without having to first access the Internet. The Examiner stated that Richman et al. provides an authenticator and pointed to the patent specification (i.e., col. 23 lines 1-12) to support that position. Applicant respectfully points out that column 23 lines 1-12 of Richman et al. points to an archival record of each installed device and compatible variations thereof. In essence, the archive is a means of ensuring the computer recognizes hardware attached directly to the computer. Richman et al. does not disclose a device, system or method that performs an authentication function.

Additionally, the Examiner points to the Richman et al. patent specification (Col. 26 lines 4-7) to support the conclusion that Richman et al. provides a chassis. However, the "expansion chassis" referred to by Richman et al. is a reference to a separate device that links multiple computers. As a result, there is no support for the conclusions that Richman et al. provides a chassis operatively coupled with an operating system, network card, wireless card and processor.

With respect to the Lee reference, even if it were combinable with Richman et al., it fails to provide a channel controller. The Examiner

suggests that Figure 4A and the description found at Column 8 lines 31-33 of the Lee reference provides a channel controller. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no reference, explicit or implicit, nor a suggestion that the bus bridge memory controller of the Lee reference has the same functionality or operative configuration as the channel controller as claimed by Applicant. In fact, the bus bridge memory controller serves four (4) essential purposes, namely, (1) assist the computer load data from read-only memory; (2) perform a power-on-self-test to make sure all the major components are functioning properly; (3) check all of the memory addresses with a quick read/write operation to ensure that there are no errors in the memory chips; and (4) ensure that the thermal limit of the central processing unit is not exceeded (Column 8 Line 28 through Column 9 line 35).

An additional limitation of the Lee disclosure is the fact that the operating system is not resident on the User-Removable Central Processing Unit Card. Therefore, even if Lee and Richman et al. are combined, the resulting disclosure would be inoperable for lack of an operating system. The Lee reference discloses a removable CPU card that requires a computer having at least one operating system. Conversely, Richman et al. provides a system that requires an operating system. Neither disclosure provides an operating system.

Independent Claims 10, 19 and 23 of the present application are drawn to a system comprising a wireless provisioning device, a carrier structure, wireless access points and an authentication protocol initiated at the wireless provisioning device. As discussed previously, Richman et al. and Lee do not describe or suggest a device capable of providing the functions of a wireless provisioning device in general, or the authentication, channel control and operating system functions in particular. As stated at page 23 lines 18-20 of Applicant's specification, "[w]ithout the wireless provisioning device, two separate wireless infrastructures would have to be erected to satisfy all types of customers." This is in part why the Richman et al. and Lee systems require several devices to achieve just a portion of the functionality provided by the wireless provisioning device.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that Richman et al. and Lee do not describe or suggest a wireless provisioning device capable of

authentication and network access nor do they disclose a system comprising such a device. Conversely, these are features of the wireless provisioning device and system of the present claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, 7, 10, 19 and 23 are not unpatentably obvious over Richman et al. in view of Lee and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 12-16, 19, 22 and 24-29, depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1, and thus incorporate all of the features thereof. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9, 12-16, 19, 22 and 24-29 also not unpatentably obvious over Richman et al. in view of Lee and are, therefore, also in condition for allowance.


Objection to Claims 17, 18 and 20, Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, Claims 11 and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated allowable if re-written in independent form. In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections have been traversed and claims 17, 18 and 20 are in condition for allowance as they presently stand.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Favorable action on this application is, therefore, solicited.

Respectfully submitted

Date: January 16, 2003


Tony D. Alexander
Registration No. 44,501

TECHNOLOGY LEGAL COUNSEL LLC
Post Office Box 1728
Evans, Georgia 30809-1728
(706) 210-4026